

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/026,637	Applicant(s) KOYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner James W Davie	Art Unit 2828	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W Davie. (3) _____.

(2) Tarik Nabi. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 January 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-23.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner acknowledged that claims 13-15 are dependent upon claim 1 and are to be grouped with claim 1. Discussed restriction requirement and agreed to withdraw finality of requirement but the restriction requirement is maintained. Applicant's arguments in regard to the 112 rejection appear to overcome the rejection of record and will be carefully considered. Device claims 1 and 16 do not require a post portion as is set forth in the process of claim 11 and thus the device could be made by another method. The drawings filed on 12/27/01 are accepted by the examiner.